REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank, Jr. et al. (US 6,546,489), hereinafter "Frank," in view of Stevens (US 2002/0133702):

5

Regarding claims 1, 6, and 12:

Independent claims 1, 6, and 12 have each been amended to overcome the claim rejections. Each of these claims now states that the bootable software delivery device is connected in <u>a disconnectable manner</u> to a computer, with a connection port used for connecting <u>in a disconnectable manner</u> the software delivery device to the computer. The amendments to the claims are fully supported in the specification such as paragraph [0030], and no new matter is added.

On the other hand, in Fig. 3 of Frank, if disk drive 424, host interface 426, and host microprocessor 432 constitute the software delivery device, the software delivery device does not connect to the computer in a disconnectable manner and the host interface 426 does not connect the software delivery device to the computer in a disconnectable manner as recited in the amended claims. The host interface 426 only connects disk drive 424 to the computer in a disconnectable manner. The host microprocessor 432 might be connecting to the computer in a disconnectable manner in certain ways, but the host interface 426 does not connect the host microprocessor 432, alone or together with disk drive 424, to the computer in a disconnectable manner.

The same argument also holds that if disk drive 424, host interface 426, and boot load microcontroller 443 constitute the software delivery device, the software delivery device does not connect to the computer in a disconnectable manner and the host interface 426

does not connect the software delivery device to the computer in a disconnectable manner as recited in the amended claims. The host interface 426 only connects disk drive 424 to the computer in a disconnectable manner. The boot load microcontroller 443 might be connecting to the computer in a disconnectable manner in certain ways, but the host

5   interface 426 does not connect the boot load microcontroller 443, alone or together with disk drive 424, to the computer in a disconnectable manner.

For these reasons, the combination of Frank and Stevens does not teach all of the limitations of the currently amended claims 1, 6, and 12, and these claims should

10   be allowable over the cited prior art. Reconsideration of claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-12 is respectfully requested. Claims 2-4, 7-9, and 11 are dependent on claims 1, 6, and 12, and should be allowed if their corresponding base claims are allowed.

15   **2. Rejection of claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank and Stevens and further in view of Strom et al. (US 2004/0003274):**

Claims 5 and 10 are dependent and should be allowed if the corresponding independent

20   claims are found allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu   Date: _____ 11/13/2006 _____

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5   P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10   Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)